



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

DE BARRY vs. WITHERS & PETERSON.

An accommodation acceptor having paid a bill for which no funds are provided by the drawer, is entitled to recover the amount from him.

The suit must be in the name of the payee to the use of the acceptor.

But if the drawer make an express promise to the acceptor to pay the debt to him, he may sue in his own name.

Semble, that this is the general rule in the United States, but in England some new consideration is required to enable the acceptor to sue in his own name.

The opinion of the Court was delivered, March 2d 1863, by

READ, J.—An accommodation acceptor having paid a bill for which no funds are provided by the drawer, is entitled to recover the amount from the drawer; for the law, in the absence of any express contract, implies a contract to indemnify. But whether the action be for money paid or specially for not indemnifying the plaintiff, still it is only a chose in action which is assignable in equity, and therefore the suit must be in the name of the assignor for the use of the assignee. But as the assignee is the real owner, it would seem but just if the debtor chooses expressly to promise to the assignee to pay the debt to him, that the assignee might sustain an action against him, in his own name; and this was the view taken in the early English cases of *Fenner vs. Meares*, 2 W. Bl. Rep. 1269, and *Israel vs. Douglass*, 1 H. Bl. Rep. 239. It would seem, however, that in England the rule at present is to require the consideration of forbearance, or some other new consideration, to enable the assignee to proceed in his own name: 1 Chitty's Pl. 15; Addison on Contracts 984.

In America, however, the early English doctrine has been adopted, and this is clearly the sound rule, for it is a promise to pay to the real owner of the debt, requiring no other consideration than the fact that the debtor is morally and equitably bound to pay it to his actual creditor, and is not allowed to discharge himself by paying it to any other person. This was the decision in Massachusetts, as early as 1813, in *Crocker vs. Whitney*, 10 Mass. 316, and reaffirmed in *Mowry vs. Todd*, 12 Id. 281. In Maryland, in *Allston vs.*

Contee, 4 H. & J. 351, a case argued by the present venerable Chief Justice of the United States, the same doctrine was held, and reaffirmed in *Barger vs. Collins*, 7 H. & J. 213. So in New Hampshire: *Currie vs. Hodgdon*, 3 N. H. 82; *Thompson vs. Emery*, 7 Foster 269. And in Vermont, *Moar vs. Wright*, 1 Verm. 57; *Bucklin vs. Ward*, 7 Id. 195. Such also is the law in Maine: *Smith vs. Berry*, 6 Shepley 122, and *Nonni vs. Hall*, Id. 332.

In New York, the same rule prevailed prior to the code which directs that suits shall be in the names of the real parties in interest: *Compton vs. Jones*, 4 Cowen 13; *DeForest vs. Frary*, 6 Id. 151; *Dubois vs. Doubleday*, 9 Wend. 317; *Jessel vs. Williamsburg Insurance Co.*, 3 Hill 88. In the revision of Swift's Digest, Vol. 1, p. 438, the law in Connecticut is thus stated: "The assignment of a chose in action will be a good consideration for the promise of the debtor to pay to the assignee, who may maintain an action in his own name on such promise." Which is also the settled law of Tennessee: *Mount Olivet Cemetery Co. vs. Shubert*, 2 Head 116.

This rule, so reasonable in itself, and so consonant to our ideas of justice, decides the present case, for the only real question before us was whether the additional count disclosed a sufficient cause of action. There is nothing in the other assignment of error.

Judgment affirmed.

ABSTRACTS OF RECENT AMERICAN DECISIONS.

SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK.¹

Admissions and Declarations of a Grantor—Deed upon Condition—Forfeiture of Condition—Performance.—The admissions of a grantor in a deed, against his own interest and tending to establish a sufficient consideration for the deed, he being an original party to the record and identified in interest with the plaintiffs, are admissible in evidence against the plaintiffs, as part of the *res gestæ*: *Spaulding vs. Hallenbeck*.

¹ From the Hon. O. L. Barbour; to appear in the 39th volume of his Reports.